

Dual Connections in Nonparametric Classical Information Geometry

M. R. Grasselli*
Dept. of Mathematics,
King's College,
Strand,
London, WC2R 2LS

28/02/2001

Abstract

We show how to obtain the mixture connection in an infinite dimensional information manifold and prove that it is dual to the exponential connection with respect to the Fisher information. We also define the α -connections and prove that they are convex mixtures of the extremal (± 1) -connections.

1 Introduction

The search for a fully-fledged infinite dimensional version of Information Geometry is an ongoing enterprise. The original ideas date back to the work of Amari [1], Efron [6] and most notably Dawid [4, 5], in which it was suggested using the natural exponential structure of the space of probability measures to obtain a manifold structure.

The first mathematically rigorous construction of such a manifold is, however, due to Pistone and Sempi [13], using the theory of Orlicz spaces as their most important analytical tool. In their seminal paper, the notion of exponential convergence is presented and an atlas consisting of maps with values in Orlicz spaces is proposed to cover the set of all probability measures equivalent to a given one. They then prove that the induced topology obtained from this atlas is equivalent to the one with exponential convergence and use this fact to prove that the atlas satisfies the conditions necessary in order to give rise to a C^∞ Banach manifold. The Banach spaces used are the so called *exponential* Orlicz spaces, denoted by L^{Φ_1} . We review their construction in section 3, with the difference that we use the Banach space M^{Φ_1} , the completion of the bounded random variables in the norm of L^{Φ_1} . We also present a direct proof that the construction yields a C^∞ Banach manifold without using the concept of exponential convergence.

*Supported by a grant from CAPES-Brazil.

Having defined the information manifold, the next step in the programme is to define the analogues of a metric and dual connections, ideas that play a leading role in parametric information geometry. A proposal for exponential and mixture, as well as for the intermediate α -connection, has been advocated by Gibilisco and Pistone [8]. However, we argue that their elegant definition does not properly generalise the original ideas from the parametric case. Their connections each act on a different vector bundle instead of all acting on the tangent bundle as in the finite dimensional case. The duality observed between them does not involve any metric, while in parametric information geometry dual connections with respect to one metric can fail to be dual with respect to an arbitrarily different metric.

We present in section 4 our proposal for the infinite dimensional exponential and mixture connections, together with the appropriate concept of duality, as well as the generalised metric that makes them dual to each other. In section 5 we also show that these definitions reduce to the familiar ones for finite dimensional submanifolds and that exponential and mixture families are geodesic for the exponential and mixture connections respectively.

We then move to the subject of α -connections in section 6, where we again rearrange the definitions of [8] in order to have them all acting on the same bundle and with the desired relation between them, the exponential and the mixture connections still holding.

2 Orlicz Spaces

We present here the aspects of the theory of Orlicz spaces that will be relevant for the construction of the information manifold. Similarly oriented short introductions to the subject can be found in [13, 12, 8]. For more comprehensive accounts the reader is referred to the monographs [14] and [9].

Recall first that a *Young* function is a convex function $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$ satisfying

- i. $\Phi(x) = \Phi(-x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$,
- ii. $\Phi(0) = 0$,
- iii. $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(x) = +\infty$.

Note that, in this generality, Φ can vanish on an interval around the origin (as opposed to vanishing iff $x = 0$) and it can also happen that $\Phi(x) = +\infty$, for $0 < x_1 \leq x$, although it must be continuous where it is finite (due to convexity). In the absence of these annoyances, most of the theorems have stronger conclusions. This will be the case for the following three Young functions used in information geometry:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1(x) &= \cosh x - 1, \\ \Phi_2(x) &= e^{|x|} - |x| - 1, \\ \Phi_3(x) &= (1 + |x|) \log(1 + |x|) - |x| \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

(in the sequel, Φ_1, Φ_2 and Φ_3 will always refer to these particular functions, with other symbols being used to denote generic Young functions). Any Young function Φ (including those with a jump to infinity) admits an integral representation

$$\Phi(x) = \int_0^x \phi(t)dt, \quad x \geq 0,$$

where $\phi : \mathbb{R}^+ \mapsto \overline{\mathbb{R}}^+$ is nondecreasing, left continuous, $\phi(0) = 0$ and $\phi(x) = +\infty$ for $x \geq a$ if $\Phi(x) = +\infty, x \geq a > 0$.

We define the complementary (conjugate) function to Φ as the Young function Ψ given by

$$\Psi(y) = \int_0^y \psi(t)dt, \quad y \geq 0,$$

where ψ is the generalised inverse of ϕ , that is

$$\psi(s) = \inf\{t : \phi(t) > s\}, \quad s \geq 0.$$

One can verify that Φ_2 and Φ_3 are a complementary pair.

Two Young functions Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 are said to be *equivalent* if there exist real numbers $0 < c_1 \leq c_2 < \infty$ and $x_0 \geq 0$ such that

$$\Psi_1(c_1x) \leq \Psi_2(x) \leq \Psi_1(c_2x), \quad x \geq x_0.$$

For example, the functions Φ_1 and Φ_2 are equivalent.

There are several classifications of Young functions according to their growth properties. The only one we are going to need for the construction of the information manifold is the so called Δ_2 -class. A Young function $\Phi : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfies the Δ_2 -condition if

$$\Phi(2x) \leq K\Phi(x), \quad x \geq x_0 \geq 0,$$

for some constant $K > 0$. Examples of functions in this class are $\Phi(x) = |x|^p, p \geq 1$ and the function Φ_3 .

Now let (Ω, Σ, μ) be a measure space. The theory of Orlicz spaces can be developed using a general measure μ . However, in several important theorems, to get necessary and sufficient conditions, instead of just sufficient ones, one needs to impose a couple of technical restrictions on the measure. In this paper, we are going to assume without further mention that all our measures have the *finite subset* property and are *diffuse* on a set of positive measure [14, p 46]. The reader must be aware that some of the results we are going to state do not hold if these conditions are not assumed and is referred to [14] for the full version of the theorems when unrestricted measures are considered. The finite subset condition only excludes pathological cases like $\mu(A) = 0$ if $A = \emptyset$ and $\mu(A) = \infty$ otherwise. It is satisfied, for instance, by all σ -finite measures. We also mention that the Lebesgue measure on the Borel σ -algebra of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is diffuse on a set of positive measure, as are many other measures likely to appear in applications of information geometry.

The *Orlicz class* associated with a Young function Φ is defined as

$$\tilde{L}^\Phi(\mu) = \left\{ f : \Omega \mapsto \overline{\mathbb{R}}, \text{measurable} : \int_{\Omega} \Phi(f) < \infty \right\}$$

It is a convex set. However, it is a vector space if and only if the function Φ satisfies the Δ_2 -condition.

The *Orlicz space* associated with a Young function Φ is defined as

$$L^\Phi(\mu) = \left\{ f : \Omega \mapsto \overline{\mathbb{R}}, \text{measurable} : \int_{\Omega} \Phi(\alpha f) < \infty, \text{ for some } \alpha > 0 \right\}$$

It is easy to prove that this is a vector space and that it coincides with $\tilde{L}^\Phi$ iff Φ satisfies the Δ_2 -condition. Moreover, if we identify functions which differ only on sets of measure zero, then L^Φ is a Banach space when furnished with the *Luxembourg norm*

$$N_\Phi(f) = \inf \left\{ k > 0 : \int_{\Omega} \Phi\left(\frac{f}{k}\right) d\mu \geq 1 \right\},$$

or with the equivalent *Orlicz norm*

$$\|f\|_\Phi = \sup \left\{ \int_{\Omega} |fg| d\mu : g \in L^\Psi(\mu), \int_{\Omega} \Psi(g) d\mu \leq 1 \right\},$$

where Ψ is the complementary Young function to Φ .

If two Young functions are equivalent, the Banach spaces associated with them coincide as sets and have equivalent norms. For example, $L^{\Phi_1}(\mu) = L^{\Phi_2}(\mu)$.

A key ingredient in the analysis of Orlicz spaces is the generalised Hölder inequality. If Φ and Ψ are complementary Young functions, $f \in L^\Phi(\mu)$, $g \in L^\Psi(\mu)$, then

$$\int_{\Omega} |fg| d\mu \leq 2N_\Phi(f)N_\Psi(g).$$

It follows that $L^\Phi \subset (L^\Psi)^*$ for any pair of complementary Young functions, the inclusion being strict in general.

Suppose now that the measure space is finite. Then it is clear that $L^\infty(\mu) \subset L^\Phi(\mu)$. Let E^Φ denote the closure of L^∞ in the L^Φ -norm and define also

$$M^\Phi = \left\{ f \in L^\Phi : \int_{\Omega} \Phi(kf) < \infty, \text{ for all } k > 0 \right\}.$$

In general, we have that $M^\Phi \subset E^\Phi$. In the next lemma, we collect for later use the results for the case of a continuous Young function vanishing only at the origin. We need the following definition first. We say that $f \in L^{\Phi_1}(\mu)$ has an *absolutely continuous* norm if $N_\Phi(f\chi_{A_n}) \rightarrow 0$ for each sequence of measurable sets $A_n \downarrow \emptyset$. In terms of the Orlicz norm, this is equivalent to the statement that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\|f\chi_A\|_\Phi = \sup \left\{ \int_A |fg| d\mu : g \in L^\Psi(\mu), \int_{\Omega} \Psi(g) d\mu \leq 1 \right\} < \varepsilon$$

provided $A \in \Sigma$ and $\mu(A) < \delta$.

Lemma 3 Suppose that $\mu(\Omega) < \infty$ and let (Φ, Ψ) be a complementary pair of Young functions, Φ continuous, $\Phi(x) = 0$ iff $x = 0$. Then:

- i. $M^\Phi = E^\Phi$.
- ii. $(M^\Phi)^* = L^\Psi$.
- iii. $f \in M^\Phi$ iff f has an absolutely continuous norm.

Furthermore, M^Φ is separable iff (Ω, Σ, μ) is separable. If, moreover, Φ satisfies the Δ_2 -condition, then $M^\Phi = L^\Phi$.

As consequences of this lemma, we obtain $(L^{\Phi_3})^* = L^{\Phi_1}$ and $(M^{\Phi_1})^* = L^{\Phi_3}$.

3 The Pistone-Sempi Information Manifold

Consider the set $\mathcal{M}$ of all the μ -almost everywhere strictly positive probability densities relative to the measure μ , that is,

$$\mathcal{M} \equiv \mathcal{M}(\Omega, \Sigma, \mu) = \{f : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}, \text{measurable} : f > 0 \text{ a.e. and } \int_{\Omega} f d\mu = 1\}.$$

For each point $p \in \mathcal{M}$, let $L^{\Phi_1}(p)$ be the exponential Orlicz space over the measure space $(\Sigma, \Omega, pd\mu)$. The measure $pd\mu$ inherits all the good properties assumed for μ (finite subset property and diffusiveness) in addition to being finite, so that all the statements from the last section hold for $L^{\Phi_1}(p)$. Instead of using the whole of $L^{\Phi_1}(p)$ as the model Banach space for the manifold to be constructed, we restrict ourselves to $M^{\Phi_1}(p) \subset L^{\Phi_1}(p)$ and take its closed subspace of p -centred random variables

$$B_p = \{u \in M^{\Phi_1}(p) : \int_{\Omega} upd\mu = 0\}$$

as the coordinate Banach space.

For definiteness, we choose to work with the Orlicz norm $\|\cdot\|_{\Phi_1}$, although everything could be done with the equivalent Luxemburg norm N_{Φ_1} , and use the notation $\|\cdot\|_{\Phi_1, p}$ when it is necessary to specify the base point p .

In probabilistic terms, the set $M^{\Phi_1}(p)$ has the characterisation given in the following lemma, whose proof is a simple adaptation of the one given in [13] for the case of $L^{\Phi_1}(p)$.

Lemma 4 $M^{\Phi_1}(p)$ coincides with the set of random variables for which the moment generating function is finite for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof: If $u \in M^{\Phi_1}(p)$, then

$$\int_{\Omega} \Phi_1(tu)pd\mu = \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{e^{tu} + e^{-tu}}{2} - 1 \right) pd\mu < \infty, \quad \text{for all } t > 0,$$

which implies

$$\int_{\Omega} e^{tu} p d\mu < \infty, \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Conversely, if $m_u(t) < \infty$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then both $\int_{\Omega} e^{tu} p d\mu$ and $\int_{\Omega} e^{-tu} p d\mu$ are finite, so $\int_{\Omega} \Phi_1(tu) p d\mu < \infty$ for all $t > 0$, which means that $u \in M^{\Phi_1}(p)$.

In particular, the moment generating functional $Z_p(u) = \int_{\Omega} e^u p d\mu$ (otherwise known as the *partition function*) is finite on the whole of $M^{\Phi_1}(p)$.

Let $\mathcal{V}_p$ be the open unit ball of B_p and consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} e_p : \mathcal{V}_p &\rightarrow \mathcal{M} \\ u &\mapsto \frac{e^u}{Z_p(u)} p. \end{aligned}$$

Denote by $\mathcal{U}_p$ the image of $\mathcal{V}_p$ under e_p . We verify that e_p is a bijection from $\mathcal{V}_p$ to $\mathcal{U}_p$, since

$$\frac{e^u}{Z_p(u)} p = \frac{e^v}{Z_p(u)} p$$

implies that $(u - v)$ is a constant random variable. But since $(u - v) \in B_p$, we must have $u = v$. Then let e_p^{-1} be the inverse of e_p on $\mathcal{U}_p$. One can check that

$$\begin{aligned} e_p^{-1} : \mathcal{U}_p &\rightarrow B_p \\ q &\mapsto \log\left(\frac{q}{p}\right) - \int_{\Omega} \log\left(\frac{q}{p}\right) p d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

and also that, for any $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{M}$,

$$\begin{aligned} e_{p_2}^{-1} e_{p_1} : e_{p_1}^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_{p_1} \cap \mathcal{U}_{p_2}) &\rightarrow e_{p_2}^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_{p_1} \cap \mathcal{U}_{p_2}) \\ u &\mapsto u + \log\left(\frac{p_1}{p_2}\right) - \int_{\Omega} \left(u + \log\frac{q}{p}\right) p_2 d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that $q \in \mathcal{U}_{p_1} \cap \mathcal{U}_{p_2}$ for some $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{M}$. Then we can write it as

$$q = \frac{e^u}{Z_p(u)} p_1,$$

for some $u \in \mathcal{V}_{p_1}$. Using the formula just obtained, we find

$$e_{p_2}^{-1}(q) = u + \log\left(\frac{p_1}{p_2}\right) - \int_{\Omega} \left(u + \log\frac{q}{p}\right) p_2 d\mu.$$

Since $e_{p_2}^{-1}(q) \in \mathcal{V}_{p_2}$, we have that

$$\|e_{p_2}^{-1}(q)\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} = \left\| u + \log\left(\frac{p_1}{p_2}\right) - \int_{\Omega} \left(u + \log\frac{q}{p}\right) p_2 d\mu \right\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} < 1.$$

Consider an open ball of radius r around $u = e_{p_1}^{-1}(q) \in e_{p_1}^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_{p_1} \cap \mathcal{U}_{p_2})$ in the topology of B_{p_1} , that is, consider the set

$$A_r = \{v \in B_{p_1} : \|v - u\|_{\Phi_1, p_1} < r\}$$

and let r be small enough so that $A_r \in \mathcal{V}_{p_1}$. Then the image in $\mathcal{M}$ of each point $v \in A_r$ under e_{p_1} is

$$\tilde{q} = e_{p_1}(v) = \frac{e^v}{Z_{p_1}(v)} p_1.$$

We claim that $\tilde{q} \in \mathcal{U}_{p_1} \cap \mathcal{U}_{p_2}$. Indeed, applying $e_{p_2}^{-1}$ to it we find

$$e_{p_2}^{-1}(\tilde{q}) = v + \log\left(\frac{p_1}{p_2}\right) - \int_{\Omega} \left(v + \log \frac{q}{p}\right) p_2 d\mu,$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_{p_2}^{-1}(\tilde{q})\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} &\leq \|v - u\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} + \left\| u + \log\left(\frac{p_1}{p_2}\right) - \int_{\Omega} \left(u + \log \frac{q}{p}\right) p_2 d\mu \right\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} \\ &\quad + \left\| \int_{\Omega} (v - u) p_2 d\mu \right\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} \\ &\leq \|v - u\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} + \|e_{p_2}^{-1}(q)\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} + \int_{\Omega} |v - u| p_2 d\mu \|1\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} \\ &= \|v - u\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} + \|e_{p_2}^{-1}(q)\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} + \|v - u\|_{1, p_2} K, \end{aligned}$$

where $K = \|1\|_{\Phi_1, p_2}$ and we use the notation $\|\cdot\|_{1, p_2}$ for the $L^1(p_2)$ -norm. It follows from the growth properties of Φ_1 that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that $\|f\|_{1, p_2} \leq c_1 \|f\|_{\Phi_1, 2}$. Moreover, it was found in [13, 12] that $L^{\Phi_1}(p_1) = L^{\Phi_1}(p_2)$, so there exists a constant $c_2 > 0$ such that $\|f\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} \leq c_2 \|f\|_{\Phi_1, p_1}$. Therefore, the previous inequality becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_{p_2}^{-1}(\tilde{q})\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} &\leq c_2 \|v - u\|_{\Phi_1, p_1} + \|e_{p_2}^{-1}(q)\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} + c_1 c_2 K \|v - u\|_{\Phi_1, p_1} \\ &= c_2 (1 + c_1 K) \|v - u\|_{\Phi_1, p_1} + \|e_{p_2}^{-1}(q)\|_{\Phi_1, p_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, is we choose

$$r < \frac{1 - \|e_{p_2}^{-1}(q)\|_{\Phi_1, p_2}}{c_2 (1 + c_1 K)},$$

we will have that

$$\|e_{p_2}^{-1}(q')\|_{\Phi_1, p_2} < 1$$

which proves the claim. What we just have proved is that $e_{p_1}^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_{p_1} \cap \mathcal{U}_{p_2})$ consists entirely of interior points in the topology of B_{p_1} , so $e_{p_1}^{-1}(\mathcal{U}_{p_1} \cap \mathcal{U}_{p_2})$ is open in B_{p_1} .

We then have that the collection $\{(\mathcal{U}_p, e_p^{-1}), p \in \mathcal{M}\}$ satisfies the three axioms for being a C^∞ -atlas for $\mathcal{M}$ (see [10, p 20]). Moreover, since all the spaces B_p are topolinear isomorphic, we can say that $\mathcal{M}$ is a C^∞ -manifold modelled on B_p .

As usual, the tangent space at each point $p \in \mathcal{M}$ can be abstractly identified with B_p . A concrete realisation has been given in [12, proposition 21], namely each

curve through $p \in \mathcal{M}$ is tangent to a one-dimensional exponential model $\frac{e^{tu}}{Z_p(tu)}p$, so we take u as the tangent vector representing the equivalence class of such a curve.

Since we are using M^{Φ_1} instead of L^{Φ_1} to construct the manifold, we need the following corresponding definition for the *maximal exponential model* at each $p \in \mathcal{M}$:

$$\mathcal{E}(p) = \left\{ \frac{e^u}{Z_p(u)}p, u \in B_p \right\}.$$

One can verify that $\mathcal{E}(p)$ is the connected component of $\mathcal{M}$ containing p .

4 The Fisher Information and Dual Connections

In the parametric version of information geometry, Amari and Nagaoka have introduced the concept of dual connections with respect to a Riemannian metric. For finite dimensional manifolds, any continuous assignment of a positive definite symmetric bilinear form to each tangent space determines a Riemannian metric. In infinite dimensions, we need to impose that the tangent space is self-dual and that the bilinear form is continuous. Since our tangent spaces B_p are not even reflexive, let alone self-dual, we abandon the idea of having a Riemannian structure on $\mathcal{M}$ and propose a weaker version of duality, the duality with respect to a continuous scalar product. When restricted to finite dimensional submanifolds, the scalar product becomes a Riemannian metric and the original definition of duality is recovered.

Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_p$ be a continuous positive definite symmetric bilinear form assigned continuously to each $B_p \simeq T_p\mathcal{M}$. A pair of connection (∇, ∇^*) are said to be dual with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_p$ if

$$\langle \tau u, \tau^* v \rangle_q = \langle u, v \rangle_p \quad (5)$$

for all $u, v \in T_p\mathcal{M}$ and all smooth curves $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that $\gamma(0) = p, \gamma(1) = q$, where τ and τ^* denote the parallel transports associated with ∇ and ∇^* , respectively. Equivalently, (∇, ∇^*) are dual with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_p$ if

$$v(\langle s_1, s_2 \rangle_p) = \langle \nabla_v s_1, s_2 \rangle_p + \langle s_1, \nabla_v^* s_2 \rangle_p \quad (6)$$

for all $v \in T_p\mathcal{M}$ and all smooth vector fields s_1 and s_2 .

We stress that this *is not* the kind of duality obtained when a connection ∇ on a bundle $\mathcal{F}$ is used to construct another connection ∇' on the dual bundle $\mathcal{F}^*$ as defined, for instance, in [8, definition 6]. The latter is a construction that does not involve any metric or scalar product and the two connections act on different bundles, while Amari's duality is a duality with respect to a specific scalar product (or metric, in the finite dimensional case) and the dual connections act on the same bundle, the tangent bundle.

The infinite dimensional generalisation of the Fisher information is given by

$$\langle u, v \rangle_p = \int_{\Omega} (uv) p d\mu, \quad \forall u, v \in B_p.$$

This is clearly bilinear, symmetric and positive definite. Also, since $L^{\Phi_1} \subset L^{\Phi_3}$, the generalised Hölder inequality gives

$$|\langle u, v \rangle_p| \leq K \|u\|_{\Phi_1, p} \|v\|_{\Phi_1, p}, \quad \forall u, v \in B_p,$$

which implies the continuity of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_p$.

The use of exponential Orlicz space to model the manifold induces naturally a globally flat affine connection on the tangent bundle $T\mathcal{M}$, called the *exponential* connection and denoted by $\nabla^{(1)}$. It is defined on each connected component of the manifold $\mathcal{M}$, which is equivalent to saying that its parallel transport is defined between points connected by an exponential model [13, theorem 4.1]. If p and q are two such points, then $L^{\Phi_1}(p) = L^{\Phi_1}(q)$ and the exponential parallel transport is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{pq}^{(1)} : T_p\mathcal{M} &\rightarrow T_q\mathcal{M} \\ u &\mapsto u - \int_{\Omega} u q d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

It is well defined, since $T_p\mathcal{M} = B_p$ and $T_q\mathcal{M} = B_q$ are subsets of the same set $M^{\Phi_1}(p) = M^{\Phi_1}(q)$, so the exponential parallel transport just subtracts a constant from u to make it centred around the right point.

We now want to define the dual connection to $\nabla^{(1)}$ with respect to the Fisher information. We begin by proving the following lemma.

Lemma 7 *Let p and q be two points in the same connected component of $\mathcal{M}$. Then $\frac{p}{q}u \in B_q$, for all $u \in B_p$.*

Proof: From the hypothesis, u has absolutely continuous norm in $L^{\Phi_1}(p)$, so for for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $A \in \Sigma$ and $\mu(A) < \delta$ implies

$$\|u\chi_A\|_{\Phi_1, p} = \sup \left\{ \int_A |uv| p d\mu : v \in L^{\Phi_3}(p), \int_{\Omega} \Phi_3(v) p d\mu \leq 1 \right\} < \varepsilon. \quad (8)$$

But since $M^{\Phi_1}(p) = M^{\Phi_1}(q)$, as they are the completion of the same set L^{∞} under equivalent norms (recall that p and q are supposed to be connected by an exponential model), we have that $L^{\Phi_3}(p) = (M^{\Phi_1}(p))^* = (M^{\Phi_1}(q))^* = L^{\Phi_3}(q)$, in the sense that they are the same set furnished with equivalent norms. We then use (8) to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon &> \sup \left\{ \int_A |uv| p d\mu : v \in L^{\Phi_3}(p), \int_{\Omega} \Phi_3(v) p d\mu \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \int_A |uv| p d\mu : v \in L^{\Phi_3}(p), N_{\Phi_3, p}(v) \leq 1 \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \sup \left\{ \int_A \left| \frac{p}{q} u(kv) \right| q d\mu : v \in L^{\Phi_3}(p), N_{\Phi_3, p}(v) \leq 1 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq \frac{1}{k} \sup \left\{ \int_A \left| \frac{p}{q} u(v') \right| q d\mu : v' \in L^{\Phi_3}(q), N_{\Phi_3, q}(v') \leq 1 \right\} \\
&= \left\| \frac{p}{q} u \chi_A \right\|_{\Phi_1, q},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the facts that $\int_{\Omega} \Phi_3(v) p d\mu \leq 1$ iff $N_{\Phi_3, p} \leq 1$ [14, theorem 3.2.3] and that there exists a constant k such that $N_{\Phi_3, p}(\cdot) \leq k N_{\Phi_3, q}(\cdot)$. Since ε was arbitrary, this proves that $\frac{p}{q} u$ has absolutely continuous norm in $L^{\Phi_1}(q)$. The lemma then follows from lemma 3 and the fact that $\frac{p}{q} u$ is centred around q .

We can then define the *mixture* connection on $T\mathcal{M}$, as

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau_{pq}^{(-1)} : T_p \mathcal{M} &\rightarrow T_q \mathcal{M} \\
u &\mapsto \frac{p}{q} u,
\end{aligned}$$

for p and q in the same connected component of $\mathcal{M}$. We notice that it is also globally flat and prove the following result.

Theorem 9 *The connections $\nabla^{(1)}$ and $\nabla^{(-1)}$ are dual with respect to the Fisher information.*

Proof: We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \tau^{(1)} u, \tau^{(-1)} v \rangle_q &= \left\langle u - \int_{\Omega} u q d\mu, \frac{p}{q} v \right\rangle_q \\
&= \int_{\Omega} u (p/q) v q d\mu - \left(\int_{\Omega} u q d\mu \right) \int_{\Omega} (p/q) v q d\mu \\
&= \int_{\Omega} u v p d\mu \\
&= \langle u, v \rangle_p, \quad \forall u, v \in B_p,
\end{aligned}$$

where, to go from the second to the third line above, we used that v is centred around p .

5 Covariant Derivatives and Geodesics

We begin this section recalling that the covariant derivative for the exponential connection has been computed in [8, proposition 25] and found to be

$$\left(\nabla_v^{(1)} s \right) (p) = (d_v s)(p) - E_p((d_v s)(p)), \quad (10)$$

where $s \in S(TM)$ is a differentiable vector field, $v \in T_p \mathcal{M}$ is a tangent vector at p , $E_p(\cdot)$ denotes the expected value with respect to the measure $p d\mu$ and $d_v s$

denotes the directional derivative in M^{Φ_1} of s composed with some patch e_p as a map between Banach spaces.

We first notice that this gives the usual covariant derivative for the exponential connection in parametric information geometry [11, pp 117-118]. For if $\{\theta^1, \dots, \theta^n\}$ is a coordinate system in a finite dimensional submanifold of $\mathcal{M}$ we can put $v = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^i}$ and $s = \frac{\partial \log p}{\partial \theta^j}$ as the 1-representation (see [2, p 41]) of the vector field $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^j}$, then (10) reduces to

$$\left(\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^i}}^{(1)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^j} \right) (p) = \frac{\partial^2 \log p}{\partial \theta^i \partial \theta^j} - E_p \left(\frac{\partial^2 \log p}{\partial \theta^i \partial \theta^j} \right),$$

which is the classical finite dimensional result. Accordingly, parametric exponential models are flat submanifolds of $\mathcal{M}$.

We can also verify that one-dimensional exponential models of the form

$$q(t) = \frac{e^{tu}}{Z_p(tu)} p$$

are geodesics for $\nabla^{(1)}$, since if $s(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \left(\log \frac{q(t)}{p} \right)$ is the vector field tangent to $q(t)$ at each point t [12, proposition 21], then (10) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\nabla_{\dot{q}(t)}^{(1)} s(t) \right) (q(t)) &= \frac{d^2}{dt^2} (tu - \log Z_p(tu)) - E_{q(t)} \left(\frac{d^2}{dt^2} (tu - \log Z_p(tu)) \right) \\ &= -\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \log Z_p(tu) + E_{q(t)} \left(\frac{d^2}{dt^2} \log Z_p(tu) \right) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

As we emphasised in the previous section, the definition given in [8, definition 22] for the mixture connection differs from ours (due to the different concepts of duality employed), so we have to compute its covariant derivative according to the definition given here, at least to have the notation right.

Proposition 11 *Let $\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be a smooth curve such that $p = \gamma(0)$ and $v = (e_p^{-1} \circ \gamma)'(0)$ and let $s \in S(TM)$ be a differentiable vector field. Then*

$$\left(\nabla_v^{(-1)} s \right) (p) = (d_v s)(p) + s(p) \ell'(0), \quad (12)$$

where $\ell(t) = \log(\gamma(t))$.

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\nabla_v^{(-1)} s \right) (p) &= \left(\nabla_{(e_p^{-1} \circ \gamma)'(0)}^{(-1)} s \right) (\gamma(0)) \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \left[\tau_{\gamma(h)\gamma(0)}^{(-1)} s(\gamma(h)) - s(\gamma(0)) \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \left[\frac{\gamma(h)}{\gamma(0)} s(\gamma(h)) - s(\gamma(0)) \right] \\
&= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} [s(\gamma(h)) - s(\gamma(0))] + \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \left[\frac{\gamma(h) - \gamma(0)}{\gamma(0)} s(\gamma(h)) \right] \\
&= (d_v s)(p) + s(p) \ell'(0).
\end{aligned}$$

Again this reduces to the parametric result for the case of submanifolds of $\mathcal{M}$. Put $v = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^i}$ and $s = \frac{\partial \log p}{\partial \theta^j}$ in (12) to obtain

$$\left(\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^i}}^{(-1)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^j} \right) (p) = \frac{\partial^2 \log p}{\partial \theta^i \partial \theta^j} + \frac{\partial \log p}{\partial \theta^i} \frac{\partial \log p}{\partial \theta^j},$$

which is the classical finite dimensional result.

The mixture connection owes its name to the fact that in the parametric version of information geometry a convex mixture of two densities describes a geodesic with respect to $\nabla^{(-1)}$. To verify the same statement in the non-parametric case, we first need to check that a convex mixture of two points in a connected component of $\mathcal{M}$ remains in the same connected component.

Proposition 13 *If q_1 and q_2 are two points in $\mathcal{E}(p)$ for some $p \in \mathcal{M}$, then*

$$q(t) = tq_1 + (1-t)q_2$$

belongs to $\mathcal{E}(p)$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$.

Proof: We begin by writing

$$q_1 = \frac{e^{u_1}}{Z_p(u_1)} p \quad \text{and} \quad q_2 = \frac{e^{u_2}}{Z_p(u_2)} p,$$

for some $u_1, u_2 \in B_p \subset M^{\Phi_1}(p)$. To simplify the notation, let us define

$$\tilde{u}_1 = u_1 - \log Z_p(u_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{u}_2 = u_2 - \log Z_p(u_2).$$

We want to show that, if we write

$$e^{\tilde{u}} p = q(t) = t e^{\tilde{u}_1} p + (1-t) e^{\tilde{u}_2} p,$$

then $\tilde{u}$ is an element of $M^{\Phi_1}(p)$, so that

$$u = \tilde{u} - \int_{\Omega} \tilde{u} p d\mu \in B_p$$

and

$$q(t) = \frac{e^u}{Z_p(u)} \in \mathcal{E}(p).$$

All we need to prove is that both $\int_{\Omega} e^{k\tilde{u}} p d\mu$ and $\int_{\Omega} e^{-k\tilde{u}} p d\mu$ are finite for all $k > 0$. We have that

$$e^{\tilde{u}} = te^{\tilde{u}_1} + (1-t)e^{\tilde{u}_2}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} e^{k\tilde{u}} &= (te^{\tilde{u}_1} + (1-t)e^{\tilde{u}_2})^k \\ &\leq 2^k \left(t^k e^{k\tilde{u}_1} + (1-t)^k e^{k\tilde{u}_2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\int_{\Omega} e^{k\tilde{u}} p d\mu \leq 2^k t^k \int_{\Omega} e^{k\tilde{u}_1} p d\mu + 2^k (1-t)^k \int_{\Omega} e^{k\tilde{u}_2} p d\mu < \infty$$

since both $\tilde{u}_1$ and $\tilde{u}_2$ are in $M^{\Phi_1}(p)$. As for the other integral, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-k\tilde{u}} &= (te^{\tilde{u}_1} + (1-t)e^{\tilde{u}_2})^{-k} \\ &= \frac{1}{(te^{\tilde{u}_1} + (1-t)e^{\tilde{u}_2})^k} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t^k e^{k\tilde{u}_1}} = t^{-k} e^{-k\tilde{u}_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\int_{\Omega} e^{-k\tilde{u}} p d\mu \leq t^{-k} \int_{\Omega} e^{-k\tilde{u}_1} p d\mu < \infty,$$

since $\tilde{u}_1 \in M\Phi_1(p)$.

We can now verify that a family of the form

$$q(t) = tq_1 + (1-t)q_2, \quad t \in (0, 1)$$

is a geodesic for $\nabla^{(-1)}$. Let $s(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \left(\log \frac{q(t)}{p} \right)$ be the vector field tangent to $q(t)$ at each point t , then (12) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\nabla_{(e_p^{-1} \circ q)'(t)}^{(-1)} s(t) \right) (q(t)) &= \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left[\log \frac{tq_1 + (1-t)q_2}{p} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{d}{dt} \left[\log \frac{tq_1 + (1-t)q_2}{p} \right] \frac{d}{dt} [\log tq_1 + (1-t)q_2] \\ &= \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{p}{tq_1 + (1-t)q_2} \frac{(q_1 - q_2)}{p} \right] \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{p}{tq_1 + (1-t)q_2} \frac{q_1 - q_2}{p} \right) \frac{(q_1 - q_2)}{tq_1 + (1-t)q_2} \\ &= - \left(\frac{(q_1 - q_2)}{tq_1 + (1-t)q_2} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{(q_1 - q_2)}{tq_1 + (1-t)q_2} \right)^2 \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

6 α -connections

In this section, we define the infinite dimensional analogue of the α -connections introduced in the parametric case independently by Chentsov [3] and Amari [1]. We use the same technique proposed by Gibilisco and Pistone [8], namely exploring the geometry of spheres in the Lebesgue spaces L^r , but modified in such a way that the resulting connections all act on the tangent bundle $T\mathcal{M}$.

We begin with Amari's α -embeddings

$$\begin{aligned}\ell_\alpha : \mathcal{M} &\rightarrow L^r(\mu) \\ p &\mapsto \frac{2}{1-\alpha} p^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}, \quad \alpha \in (-1, 1),\end{aligned}$$

where $r = \frac{2}{1-\alpha}$.

Observe that

$$\|\ell_\alpha(p)\|_r = \left[\int_\Omega \ell_\alpha(p)^r d\mu \right] = \left[\int_\Omega \left(\frac{2}{1-\alpha} p^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} \right)^r d\mu \right]^{1/r} = r,$$

so $\ell_\alpha(p) \in S^r(\mu)$, the sphere of radius r in $L^r(\mu)$ (we warn the reader that throughout this paper, the r in S^r refers to the fact that this is a sphere of radius r , while the fact that it is a subset of L^r is judiciously omitted from the notation).

According to Gibilisco and Pistone [8], the tangent space to $S^r(\mu)$ at a point f is

$$T_f S^r(\mu) = \left\{ g \in L^r(\mu) : \int_\Omega g f^* d\mu = 0 \right\},$$

where $f^* = \text{sgn}(f)|f|^{r-1}$. In our case,

$$f = \ell_\alpha(p) = r p^{1/r}$$

so that

$$f^* = \left(r p^{1/r} \right)^{r-1} = r^{r-1} p^{1-1/r}.$$

Therefore, the tangent space to $S^r(\mu)$ at $r p^{1/r}$ is

$$T_{r p^{1/r}} S^r(\mu) = \left\{ g \in L^r(\mu) : \int_\Omega g p^{1-1/r} d\mu = 0 \right\}.$$

We now look for a concrete realisation of the push-forward of the map ℓ_α when the tangent space $T_p \mathcal{M}$ is identified with B_p as in the previous sections. Since

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{2}{1-\alpha} p^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} \right) = p^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} \frac{d \log p}{dt},$$

the push-forward can be formally implemented as

$$\begin{aligned}(\ell_\alpha)_{*(p)} : T_p \mathcal{M} = B_p &\rightarrow T_{r p^{1/r}} S^r(\mu) \\ u &\mapsto p^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}} u.\end{aligned}$$

For this to be well defined, we need to check that $p^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}u$ is an element of $T_{rp^{1/r}}S^r(\mu)$. Indeed, since $L^{\Phi_1}(p) \subset L^s(p)$ for all $s > 1$, we have that

$$\int_{\Omega} \left(p^{1/r}u\right)^r d\mu = \int_{\Omega} u^r p d\mu < \infty,$$

so $p^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2}}u \in L^r(\mu)$. Moreover

$$\int_{\Omega} p^{1/r} u p^{1-1/r} d\mu = \int_{\Omega} u p d\mu = 0,$$

which verifies that $p^{1/r}u \in T_{rp^{1/r}}S^r(\mu)$.

The sphere $S^r(\mu)$ inherits a natural connection obtained by projecting the trivial connection on $L^r(\mu)$ (the one where parallel transport is just the identity map) onto its tangent space at each point. For each $f \in S^r(\mu)$, a canonical projection from the tangent space $T_f L^r(\mu)$ onto the tangent space $T_f S^r(\mu)$ can be uniquely defined, since the spaces $L^r(\mu)$ are uniformly convex [7], and is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_f : T_f L^r(\mu) &\rightarrow T_f S^r(\mu) \\ g &\mapsto g - \left(r^{-r} \int_{\Omega} g f^* d\mu \right) f. \end{aligned}$$

When $f = rp^{1/r}$ and $f^* = r^{r-1}p^{1-1/r}$, the formula above gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{rp^{1/r}} : T_{rp^{1/r}} L^r(\mu) &\rightarrow T_{rp^{1/r}} S^r(\mu) \\ g &\mapsto g - \left(\int_{\Omega} g p^{1-1/r} d\mu \right) p^{1/r}. \end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to define the α -connections. In what follows, $\tilde{\nabla}$ is used to denote the trivial connection on $L^r(\mu)$.

Definition 14 For $\alpha \in (-1, 1)$, let $\gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be a smooth curve such that $p = \gamma(0)$ and $v = \dot{\gamma}(0)$ and let $s \in S(T\mathcal{M})$ be a differentiable vector field. The α -connection on $T\mathcal{M}$ is given by

$$(\nabla_v^\alpha s)(p) = (\ell_\alpha)_{*(p)}^{-1} \left[\Pi_{rp^{1/r}} \tilde{\nabla}_{(\ell_\alpha)_{*(p)}v} (\ell_\alpha)_{*(\gamma(t))} s \right]. \quad (15)$$

A formula like (15) deserves a more wordy explanation. We take the vector field s and push it forward along the curve γ to obtain $(\ell_\alpha)_{*(\gamma(t))}s$. Then we take its covariant derivative with respect to the trivial connection $\tilde{\nabla}$ in the direction of $(\ell_\alpha)_{*(p)}v$, the push-forward of the tangent vector v . The result is a vector in $T_{rp^{1/r}}L^r(\mu)$, so we use the canonical projection Π to obtain a vector in $T_{rp^{1/r}}S^r(\mu)$. Finally, we pull it back to $T_p\mathcal{M}$ using $(\ell_\alpha)_{*(p)}^{-1}$.

The next theorem shows that the relation between the exponential, the mixture and the α -connections just defined is the same as in the parametric case. Its proof resembles the calculation in the last pages of [8], except that all our connections act on the same bundle, whereas in [8] each one is defined on its own bundle-connection pair.

Theorem 16 *The exponential, mixture and α -connections on $T\mathcal{M}$ satisfy*

$$\nabla^\alpha = \frac{1+\alpha}{2}\nabla^{(1)} + \frac{1-\alpha}{2}\nabla^{(-1)}. \quad (17)$$

Proof: Let $\ell(t) = \log(\gamma(t))$ with γ , s , p and v as in definition 14. Before explicitly computing the derivatives in (15), observe that since $s(\gamma(t)) \in B_{\gamma(t)}$ for each $t \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} s(\gamma(t)) \gamma(t) d\mu &= 0 \\ \int_{\Omega} \frac{ds(\gamma(t))}{dt} \gamma(t) d\mu &= - \int_{\Omega} s(\gamma(t)) \frac{d\gamma(t)}{dt} d\mu \\ \int_{\Omega} \frac{ds(\gamma(t))}{dt} \gamma(t) d\mu &= - \int_{\Omega} s(\gamma(t)) \frac{d\log(\gamma(t))}{dt} \gamma(t) d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for $t = 0$, we get

$$\int_{\Omega} (d_v s)(p) p d\mu = - \int_{\Omega} s(p) \dot{\ell}(0) p d\mu \quad (18)$$

We can now look more closely at (15). It reads

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla_v^\alpha s)(p) &= p^{-1/r} \left[\Pi_{rp^{1/r}} \widetilde{\nabla}_{p^{1/r}v} \gamma(t)^{1/r} s(\gamma(t)) \right] \\ &= p^{-1/r} \left[\Pi_{rp^{1/r}} \frac{d}{dt} \left(\gamma(t)^{1/r} s(\gamma(t)) \right) \Big|_{t=0} \right] \\ &= p^{-1/r} \left[\Pi_{rp^{1/r}} \left(\frac{1}{r} p^{1/r} \frac{d\log(\gamma(t))}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} s(p) + p^{1/r} \frac{ds(\gamma(t))}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} \right) \right] \\ &= p^{-1/r} \left[\Pi_{rp^{1/r}} \left(\frac{1}{r} p^{1/r} \ell'(0) s(p) + p^{1/r} (d_v s)(p) \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{r} \ell'(0) s(p) + (d_v s)(p) - \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{r} \ell'(0) s(p) + (d_v s)(p) \right) p d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

At this point we make use of (18) in the integrand above to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\nabla_v^\alpha s)(p) &= \frac{1}{r} \ell'(0) s(p) + (d_v s)(p) + \left(\frac{1}{r} - 1 \right) \int_{\Omega} (d_v s)(p) p d\mu \\ &= \left(\frac{1+\alpha}{2} \right) [(d_v s)(p) - E_p((d_v s)(p))] + \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} \right) [(d_v s)(p) + s(p) \ell'(0)] \\ &= \frac{1+\alpha}{2} (\nabla_v^{(1)} s)(p) + \frac{1-\alpha}{2} (\nabla_v^{(-1)} s)(p). \end{aligned}$$

A direct application of (6) gives the following.

Corollary 19 *The connections ∇^α and $\nabla^{-\alpha}$ are dual with respect to the Fisher information $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_p$.*

References

- [1] S.-I. Amari, **Differential Geometric Methods in Statistics**, *Lecture Notes in Statistics*, **28**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985.
- [2] S.-I. Amari and H. Nagaoka, **Methods of Information Geometry**, *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*, **191**, American Mathematical Society, 2000.
- [3] N. N. Čencov, **Statistical Decision Rules and Optimal Inferences**, *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1982.
- [4] A. P. Dawid, *Discussion of “Defining the curvature of a statistical problem (with applications to second order efficiency)” by B. Efron*, *Ann. Statist.*, **3**, 1231-1234, 1975.
- [5] A. P. Dawid, *Further comments on some comments on a paper by Bradley Efron*, *Ann. Statist.*, **5**, 1249, 1977.
- [6] B. Efron, *Defining the curvature of a statistical problem (with applications to second order efficiency)(with discussion)*, *Ann. Statist.*, **3**, 1189-1242, 1975.
- [7] P. Gibilisco and T. Isola, *Connections on Statistical Manifolds of Density Operators by Geometry of Noncommutative L^p -spaces*, *Inf. Dim. Analysis, Quant. Prob. and Rel. Top.*, **2**, 169-178, 1999.
- [8] P. Gibilisco and G. Pistone, *Connections on nonparametric statistical manifolds by Orlicz space geometry*, *Inf. Dim. Analysis, Quant. Prob. and Rel. Top.*, **1**, 325-347, 1998.
- [9] M. A. Krasnosel’skiĭ, M. A. and Ya. B. Rutickiĭ, **Convex functions and Orlicz spaces**, Noordhoff Ltd., Groningen, 1961.
- [10] S. Lang, **Differential and Riemannian Manifolds**, Springer-Verlag, 1995.
- [11] M. K. Murray and J. W. Rice, **Differential Geometry and Statistics**, *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability*, **48**, Chapman & Hall, 1993.
- [12] G. Pistone and M. P. Rogantin, *The exponential statistical manifold: mean parameters, orthogonality and space transformations*, *Bernoulli* **5**, no. 4, 721-760, 1999.

- [13] G. Pistone and C. Sempì, *An infinite dimensional geometric structure on the space of all probability measures equivalent to a given one*, Ann. Stat., **23**, 1543-1561, 1995.
- [14] M.M. Rao and Z. D. Ren, **Theory of Orlicz spaces**, *Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics*, **146**, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1991.